## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

**DISADRA ADAMS** 

2525 Welsh Road, Apt. M2

Philadelphia, PA 19114

and

MAXWELL BROWN

108 Whitely Terrace

Darby, PA 19023

and

**HURLEY DESPER** 

846 Meadowbrook Dr.

Huntington Valley, PA 19006

and

**BRANDON MARSHALL** 

2316 Oriel Drive

Bensalem, PA 19020

and

LATASHA MORGAN

4827 Darrah St.

Philadelphia, PA 19124

and

RODNEY PHILLIPS

2505 Alfred Drive, Apt. E

Yeadon, PA 19050

and

PEGGY BELCHER

31 Highgate Lane,

Bluebell, PA 19422

Plaintiffs,

v.

BAYVIEW ASSET MANAGEMENT, LLC:

4425 Ponce de Leon Blvd. 5th Floor

Coral Gables, FL 33146

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.:

DOCKET NO:

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND** 

**COLLECTIVE ACTION ON BEHALF** 

OF PLAINTIFFS AND ALL SIMILARLY

SITUATED PERSONS

#### **COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

Disadra Adams, Maxwell Browne, Hurley Desper, Brandon Marshall, Latasha Morgan, Rodney Phillips, Peggy Belcher (*hereinafter* referred to collectively as "Plaintiffs," unless otherwise indicated), on behalf of themselves and all employees/former employees who are similarly situated to them (as described *infra*) hereby bring this collective action against Defendant.

#### INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs have initiated the instant collective action to redress violations by Defendant of the Fair Labor Standards Act "FLSA" (29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et. seq.). Plaintiffs assert that Defendant failed to pay them overtime compensation along with all employees/former employees who are similarly situated to them (as described *infra*).

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 1331, has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims because they arise under a federal law the FLSA.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this State and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in <u>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</u>, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
  - 6. Plaintiffs are adult *sui juris* individuals with addresses as set forth above.
- 7. Defendant Bayview Asset Management, LLC. (hereinafter "Defendant") is a full service mortgage investment firm that is headquartered at the above-caption address with additional locations in Florida, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Illinois.
- 8. At all times relevant herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendant.

#### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 9. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 10. Plaintiffs (as well as the putative collective class of plaintiffs) to this collective action consist of employees who worked for Defendant dating back 3 years from the filing of the instant lawsuit.
- 11. Plaintiffs (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) to this collective action consist of (and will consist of additional) employees who worked for Defendant at the following locations:
  - a. Fort Washington, Pennsylvania;
  - b. Hurst, Texas;
  - c. Chicago, Illinois;
  - d. Coral Gables, Florida; and

- e. Pompano Beach, Florida.
- 12. Plaintiffs (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) consist of those employees who held the position of a residential asset manager (*hereinafter* "RAM") during their respective tenures with Defendant at any of the aforementioned locations (within the aforesaid statutory period).
- 13. Plaintiff Disadra Adams (hereinafter "Plaintiff Adams") worked for Defendant for approximately one (1) year as an RAM until her separation from Defendant in or about August of 2013.
- 14. Plaintiff Maxwell Browne (hereinafter "Plaintiff Browne") worked for Defendant for approximately six (6) months as an RAM until his separation from Defendant in or about May of 2013.
- 15. Plaintiff Hurley Desper (hereinafter "Plaintiff Desper") worked for Defendant for approximately thirteen (13) months as an RAM until his separation from Defendant in or about May of 2013.
- 16. Plaintiff Brandon Marshall (hereinafter "Plaintiff Marshall") worked for Defendant for approximately six (6) months as an RAM until his separation from Defendant in or about May of 2013.
- 17. Plaintiff Latasha Morgan (hereinafter "Plaintiff Morgan") became a full-time permanent employee of Defendant in or about June of 2012 and remained employed with Defendant as an RAM until her separation from Defendant in or about September of 2013.
- 18. Plaintiff Rodney Phillips (hereinafter "Plaintiff Phillips") worked for Defendant for approximately ten (10) months as an RAM until his separation from Defendant in or about September of 2013.

- 19. Plaintiff Peggy Belcher (hereinafter "Plaintiff Belcher") worked for Defendant for approximately ten (10) months as an RAM until her separation from Defendant in or about September of 2013.
- 20. While employed with Defendant, Plaintiffs' (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) job responsibilities consisted of providing assistance to upper management and/or Defendant's underwriting department with modifications, short sales, and other delinquent portfolios through data entry, handling in-bound and out-bound collection calls, and gathering documents (necessary to complete short sales, modifications, and/or forbearances) from borrowers.
- 21. Plaintiffs, as well as other similarly situated RAMs, did not have responsibilities and/or the ability to supervise, discipline, evaluate, hire or terminate employees of Defendant during their respective tenures with Defendant.
- 22. Plaintiffs as well as RAMs similarly situated to them also did not have responsibilities to make management or business decisions for Defendant relating to purchasing assets, marketing, sales/financial targets, or other company financial decisions.
- 23. During their employment, Plaintiffs (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) did not have the ability to approve and/or finalize loan modifications, short sales, forbearances, or any other decisions regarding delinquent portfolios without clear consent and/or approval from management or Defendant's underwriting department.
- 24. While employed with Defendant, Plaintiffs and other RAMs similarly situated to them were/are paid by salary.

- 31. At all times relevant herein, Defendant has and continues to be an "employer" within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §203 ("FLSA").
- 32. At all times relevant herein, Defendant to this Action was responsible for paying wages to Plaintiffs and RAMs similarly situated to Plaintiffs.
- 33. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs were employed with Defendant as "employee[s]" within the meaning of the FLSA, as were employees who also worked as drivers and who were similarly situated to Plaintiffs.
- 34. The FLSA requires covered employers, such as Defendant, to minimally compensate its "non-exempt" employees, such as Plaintiffs, 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for each hour that the employee works over 40 in a workweek.
- 35. At all times during his employment with Defendant, Plaintiffs were "non-exempt" employees within the meaning of the FLSA.

Defendant's violations of the FLSA as to Plaintiffs and RAMs who are/were similarly situated to Plaintiffs include, but are not limited to:

- a. Not paying them at least 1.5 times their regular hourly rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty per work week;
- Not using proper record keeping mandated by the Department of Labor to
   ensure that they were paid for each and every hour they worked;
- a. Intentionally mischaracterizing Plaintiffs and similarly situated residential asset managers as "exempt" employees solely to avoid state and/or federal wage obligations and cheat Plaintiffs out of legally entitled earnings.
- b. Misrepresenting the amount of hours actually worked by Plaintiffs and similarly situated RAMs on their bi-weekly paychecks.

36. As a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the wages and overtime

compensation due them (and other RAMs who were similarly situated to Plaintiffs), Defendants

violated the FLSA, causing Plaintiffs and similarly situated RAMs to suffer damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court enter an Order providing that:

(1) Defendant is to be prohibited from continuing to maintain its illegal policy, practice

or customs in violation of state and federal wage laws;

(2) Defendant is to compensate, reimburse, and make Plaintiffs and all RAMs similarly

situated to Plaintiffs whole for any and all pay and benefits they would have received

had it not been for Defendant's illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost

earnings and wages. They should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld.

(3) Plaintiffs and employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs should be awarded liquidated

damages as applicable under the laws which they are suing in an amount believed to

be appropriate to deter such conduct by Defendant in the future; and

(4) Plaintiff and employees similarly situated to Plaintiffs are to be awarded the costs and

expenses of this action and reasonable legal fees as provided by applicable federal

and state law.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road

Two Greenwood Square

Suite 128

Bensalem, PA 19020

Date: October 10, 2013

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### **CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

•		CIVIL ACTION	
	:		
ement, LLC	:	NO.	
ase Management ve a copy on all de event that a defe shall, with its firs arties, a Case Man lieves the case sho	frack Designated fendants. (See andant does no at appearance, nagement Tracould be assigned.)	tion Form in all civil cases at the ties 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rest agree with the plaintiff regarding submit to the clerk of court and ser k Designation Form specifying the ed.	me o
brought under 28	U.S.C. § 224	1 through § 2255.	( )
			( )
uired to be design	ated for arbitra	ation under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )
ving claims for pe	rsonal injury o	or property damage from	· ·
s complex and that	at need special	or intense management by	
			( )
<ul> <li>Cases that do no</li> </ul>	t fall into any	one of the other tracks.	<b>(</b> X )
Ari R. Karpf <b>Attorney-a</b>	t-law	Plaintiff  Attorney for	<del></del>
(215) 639-49	70	akarpf@karpf-law.com	
FAX Num	_		
	vil Justice Expense ase Management ve a copy on all devent that a defer shall, with its first arties, a Case Manieves the case show the case of the case show the case of the case show the case of the	vil Justice Expense and Delay Rase Management Track Designate a copy on all defendants. (See event that a defendant does not shall, with its first appearance, arties, a Case Management Tractieves the case should be assigned for CASE MANAGE brought under 28 U.S.C. § 224 requesting review of a decision enying plaintiff Social Security I wired to be designated for arbitrativing claims for personal injury of Cases that do not fall into tracks a complex and that need special side of this form for a detailed of Cases that do not fall into any	ement, LLC  NO.  Il Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, couns ase Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the tive a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the revent that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and ser arties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the dieves the case should be assigned.  FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:  It brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.  It requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health enying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.  Buired to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.  It wing claims for personal injury or property damage from  Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are s complex and that need special or intense management by side of this form for a detailed explanation of special  Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.  Ari R. Karpf  Attorney-at-law  Plaintiff  Attorney for

(Civ. 660) 10/02

### Case 2:13-cv-05967-AB Document 1 Filed 10/11/13 Page 9 of 11

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Address of Plaintiff: See attached sheet		····
Address of Defendant: 4425 Ponce de Leon Blvd., 5th Floor, Cora	l Gables, FL 33146	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendant's place of business (Use Reverse Side Fo	r Additional Space	<del></del>
·		
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporatio (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1		•
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yesu No 🔼	
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:  Case Number: Judge	Pata Panningtoi.	
Case Humber.	Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	·	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	year previously terminated action in this court?	
	Yes□ No□	
<ol><li>Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a pricaction in this court?</li></ol>	or suit pending or within one year previously terminated	
	Yes□ No□	
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	er numbered case pending or within one year previously	
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□	
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil ri	ghts case filed by the same individual?	
	Yes□ No□	
CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)		
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1.   Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	
2. □ FELA	2.   Airplane Personal Injury	
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3.   Assault, Defamation	
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury	
5. □ Patent	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury	٠
6. X Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)	
7. D Civil Rights	7. D Products Liability	
8.   Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability - Asbestos	
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases	
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)	
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)		
ARBITRATION CER		
(Check Appropriate , Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record do hereby ce		
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge as		f
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;  Relief other than monetary damages is sought.		
10/10/2012	A D.V.O.40.4	
DATE: 10/10/2013	ARK2484	
Attomey-at-Law  NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if t	Attorney I.D.# 91538 here has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending except as noted above.	or within one year previously terminated action in this court	
DATE: 10/10/2013	ARK2484	
Attomey-at-Law CIV. 609 (5/2012)	Attorney I.D.# 91538	

#### Plaintiff Addresses:

DISADRA ADAMS 2525 Welsh Road, Apt. M2 Philadelphia, PA 19114

MAXWELL BROWN 108 Whitely Terrace Darby, PA 19023

HURLEY DESPER 846 Meadowbrook Dr. Huntington Valley, PA 19006

BRANDON MARSHALL 2316 Oriel Drive Bensalem, PA 19020

LATASHA MORGAN 4827 Darrah St. Philadelphia, PA 19124

RODNEY PHILLIPS 2505 Alfred Drive, Apt. E Yeadon, PA 19050

PEGGY BELCHER 31 Highgate Lane Bluebell, PA 19422

#### Case 2:13-cv-05967-AB Document 1 Filed 10/11/13 Page 11 of 11 IL COVER SHEET

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
DISADRA ADAMS, et al.		BAYVIEW AS	BAYVIEW ASSET MANAGEMENT, LLC		
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia	County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant	Miami-Dade	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ame, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	iress)	D CONDEMNATION CASES, US	E THE LOCATION OF THE	
Two Greenwood	erutti, P.C., 3331 Street Road, Square, Suite 128, Bensalem, 639-0801, akarpf@karpf-law.co	LAND I Attorneys (If Known)	NVOLVED.	D THE	
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES(	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	P	FF DEF □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pri of Business In This		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<ul> <li>4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)</li> </ul>		2		
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	O 6 O 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	(T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	erennen wie der eine Geschaften der der Ausschlieben der Weiter der Ausschlieben der Geschaften der Geschaften	A DOMESTICAL PLANTS OF THE STANDARD STANDS	13M AND	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Slander   368 Asbestos Person   Injury Product   Liability   Liability   ERSONAL PROPER   370 Other Fraud   371 Truth in Lending   355 Motor Vehicle   Product Liability   Product Liability   385 Property Damag   Product Liability   Product Liability	1 610 Agriculture    620 Other Food & Drug   625 Drug Related Seizure   625 Drug Related Seizure   630 Liquor Laws   640 R.R. & Truck   650 Airline Regs.   660 Occupational   Safety/Health   690 Other   710 Fair Labor Standards   Act   720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations   730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting   & Disclosure Act   740 Railway Labor Act   790 Other Labor Litigation   791 Empl. Ret. Inc.   Security Act	422 Appeal 28 USC 158     423 Withdrawal	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts	
1 Original 2 Re	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from 3 Remanded from atte Court  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a Fair Labor Standards Act "FL	Reopened another (speci	ferred from 6 Multidistrer district Litigation Litigation al statutes unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Fair Labor Standards Act "FL Brief description of cause: Violations of the FLSA.	SA" 29USC201			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation: ZDIZ	SICNATIIDE	FATTORNEY OF RECORD			
DAIL	SIGNATURE	ATTOMBET OF ADOUAD	<u>~</u>		

Print Save As... **Export as PDF** 

Retrieve PDF File

Reset